UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,359	02/24/2004	Gary A. Freeman	04644-156001	3423
26161 FISH & RICHA	7590 05/20/200 ARDSON PC	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 1022		GEDEON, BRIAN T		
MIINNEAPOLI	S, MN 55440-1022		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3766	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/20/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application	No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summers		10/786,359		FREEMAN ET AL.					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit					
		Brian T. Geo		3766					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).									
Status									
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on								
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL 2b) This action is non final								
3)□	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is								
J)الــا	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
	closed in accordance with the practice under a	LA Parte Quay	ne, 1999 O.D. 11, 40	0.0.210.					
Dispositi	on of Claims								
4)🛛	Claim(s) <u>1-29</u> is/are pending in the application.								
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
6)⊠	☐ Claim(s) <u>1-29</u> is/are rejected.								
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election req	uirement.						
Applicati	on Papers								
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.									
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.									
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).									
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).									
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.									
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 									
2) Notic 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) se of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4 5 6)	te					

Application/Control Number: 10/786,359 Page 2

Art Unit: 3766

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to the amendment after non-final filed 22 January 2008.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 7-29 are objected to because of the following informalities: A claimed numbered "6" has been omitted; thereby causing succeeding claims to be misnumbered. Due to the misnumbering, claims may improperly dependent on misnumbered base claims. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States
- 4. Claims 1, 2, 7-16, 19, 23, 26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Halperin et al. (US Patent no. 6,390,996).

Examiner maintains the 102(b) rejection under Halperin et al. against claims 1, 2, 7-16, 19, 23, 26 and 28.

Application/Control Number: 10/786,359 Page 3

Art Unit: 3766

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halperin et al. (US Patent no. 6,390,996).

Examiner maintains the 103(a) rejection under Halperin et al. against claims 3-5.

7. Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halperin et al. (US Patent no. 6,390,996) in view of Haberl et al. (US Patent no. 5,211,179).

Examiner maintains the 103(a) rejection under Halperin et al. against claims 20-22.

Double Patenting

8. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory

double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claims 1-29 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 45-52 of U.S. Patent No. 7,220,235.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both recite a method for removing CPR induced artifact from ECG signals using derived velocity information.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claims 17, 18, 24, 25, 27, and 29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims were indicated allowable in the previous Office action.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 22 January 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's argument that Halperin does not use the derived velocity to reduce an artifact in a physiological signal, Halperin describes a hand-held

chest compression monitor 10 wherein ECG signal lines 56 may be coupled to, col 9 lines 4-8. Two gyros 24 and 25 are used to measure angular velocity. CPR induced artifact must be eliminated from the ECG signal in order to produce an accurate ECG recording. Velocity is an example of noise associated with CPR artifact, col 11 lines 50-58. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to filter out the noise associated with velocity of CPR compressions in order to achieve an intelligible and accurate ECG signal.

Conclusion

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian T. Gedeon whose telephone number is (571) 272-3447. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

Application/Control Number: 10/786,359 Page 6

Art Unit: 3766

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl H. Layno can be reached on (571) 272-4949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Carl H. Layno/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3766

Carl H. Layno Examiner Art Unit 3766

/B. T. G./ Examiner, Art Unit 3766